

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 4, 2010 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-23 and 29-104 are in the case. Claims 29 - 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-23 and 29-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dlugos Sr. *et al* in view of Redford *et al*.

By this paper, claims 1-23 and 29-104 have been cancelled and claims 105-143 have been added. Claims 105-143 are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

The new claims avoid the rejections in the Office Action. First, the prior art relied upon in the Office Action does not contain all the elements recited in the new claims. Second, the rationale for obviousness in the Office Action is improper as mere conclusory statements. It does not provide an analysis finding every claim limitation and an explanation of how one of ordinary skill in the art would combine all the elements in the claims using only conventional thinking as of the time of the invention. Conventional thinking would not result in the presently claimed combinations, and the Office Action is not allowed to use Applicant's claim as a template to make combinations.

In the event that the examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims, which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this 4th day of January, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

/A. John Pate 110104 2779-2-2/

A. John Pate
Reg. No. 36,234
Customer No. 11653
Attorney for Applicant